

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in this application. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 20, 46-47, 49, and 51 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Fields et al.* (USP 6,412,008). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In response to Applicant's arguments included in the Reply filed June 15, 2005, the Examiner responds by maintaining his rejection and providing additional support for the rejection. However, Applicant maintains that the teachings of *Fields et al.* are insufficient to anticipate the pending claims.

At the outset, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant filed at least three arguments against the Examiner's rejection of the claims. However, in the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner only responded to two of the three arguments. Should the Examiner maintain his rejection of the claims, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner properly respond to all arguments included herein and in the Reply filed June 15, 2005.

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Fields et al.* discloses generating edit-command information which represents a command to edit the editing object in accordance with the editing information and also transferring the edit-command information to the image server, at the edit-command unit cited in column 6, lines 10-30 and obtaining intermediate processed image data by applying an editing image to the editing data in accordance with the edit-command information and also transferring the intermediate processed image data to the client, at the editing unit citing to column 6, lines 32-45. The Examiner further

provides additional support for the rejection at col. 7, lines 1-35. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

The disclosure of *Fields et al.* is directed to a system and method for cooperative client/server customization of web pages. *Fields et al.* discloses a process by which a client sends a request for a network file, such as a web page, to a server. The server obtains the requested network file, and a server side customization program and customizes the file. The server side customization program may also analyze the network file and may embed return customization information in a customized network file. The client receives the customized network file, including the return customized information, from the server. A client side customization program then performs further customization on the network file (abstract).

Specifically, at column 7, lines 1-19, *Fields et al.* discloses:

Referring now to FIG. 5, the server side of the process will be described. The server receives an HTTP request from the client (step 120), and obtains the requested network file (step 122). The server reads the user agent string (step 124), and checks to see if the user agent string is in its database (step 126). As discussed above, with reference to FIG. 3A, the user agent string typically includes the Internet address (i.e. IP address), platform, browser, and browser revision number of the requesting client. The server maintains a list, or database, of known user agent strings, along with customization data corresponding to each user agent string. If the user agent string is found in the server's database (i.e. the answer to the question in step 126 is "yes"), the requested Web page is customized for the particular user agent (step 128). For example, if the user agent string is from a particular brand of palmtop computer, the customization data will include the display size of the computer. The server can then eliminate graphics that are wider than the display size, and modify table widths in order to fit them on the screen.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image editing method comprising generating edit-command information which represents a command to edit the editing object in accordance with the editing information and also transferring the edit-command information to the image server, at the edit-command unit and obtaining intermediate processed image data by applying an editing process to the editing data in

accordance with the edit-command information and also transferring the intermediate processed image data to the client, at the editing unit. As noted above, *Fields et al.* merely discloses the server receiving an HTTP request from the client and obtaining the requested network file. The server reads the user agent string (step 124), and checks to see if the user agent string is in its database. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Fields et al.* that is directed to generating command edit-command information at the edit-command unit and obtaining intermediate processed image data by applying an editing process to the editing data in accordance with the edit-command information at the editing unit. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least this reason, *Fields et al.* fails to anticipate claim 1.

In response to Applicant's arguments that *Fields et al.* fails to disclose transferring editing information, which represent the one editing object corresponding to the inquiry, to the client, at the editing unit, the Examiner provides additional support at col. 7, lines 1-35. Applicant respectfully disagrees that these teachings are sufficient to anticipate this claim element.

Fields et al. discloses at column 7, lines 19-35 as follows:

The server next checks to see if any corporate options have been set (step 130). If so, the file is customized according to the requested corporate options (step 132). Then, the server checks to see if any personal options have been set (step 134), and, if so, the file is customized according to the requested personal options (step 136).

The file is then analyzed (step 138), and the server determines the return customization information to send to the client (step 140). This return customization information is set or embedded in the file (as discussed above with reference to FIGS. 3B and 3C) (step 142), and the customized file, along with the return customization information, is sent to the client (step 144).

FIGS. 6 through 11 depict several examples of the present invention. These examples are shown for illustrative purposes only, and are not meant to be limiting. Their purpose is to illustrate the many and varied uses of the present invention.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image editing method comprising transferring editing information, which represents the one editing object corresponding to the inquiry, to the client, at the editing unit. It is respectfully submitted that while *Fields et al.* disclose the server side customization program customizing the file according to the user agent string, and embedding return customization information in a customized file, that these teachings are insufficient to teach or suggest transferring editing information, which represent the one editing object corresponding to the inquiry, to the client, at the editing unit. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that *Fields et al.* fails to anticipate the present invention by failing to teach or suggest all of the claimed elements. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Finally, Applicant argued that the disclosure of *Fields et al.* is clearly directed to a method and system for editing and customizing web pages. However, the Examiner has failed to address this argument. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner properly respond.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 3-4 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 2, 5-7, 20, 46-47, 49, and 51 include at least one element similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus, these claims together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Additional Comments

Applicant is filing concurrently with this Reply a Request for Personal Interview. Prior to formal consideration of this Reply on the record, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule an Interview to discuss the issues included herein.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 09/760,795
Amendment dated January 9, 2006
After Final Office Action of September 7, 2005

Docket No.: 2091-0229P

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Marc S. Weiner
Registration No.: 32,181
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant